

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 09/698,779 | 10/27/2000 | Peter Michael Gits | 2705-137 | 7155 |
| 20575 75 | 590 08/30/2006 | | EXAMINER | |
| MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. 210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400 | | | BATES, KEVIN T | |
| PORTLAND, | • | +00 | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE | |
| | | | 2155 | |
| | | DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Response to Rule 312 Communication | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | 09/698,779 | GITS ET AL. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Kevin Bates | 2155 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address – | | | | | | | |
| The amendment filed on <u>August 17, 2006</u> under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been: a) ☐ entered. | | | | | | | |
| b) 🗌 | entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention. | | | | | | |
| c) disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee. Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue. | | | | | | | |
| d) 🛚 | ☑ disapproved. See explanation below. | | | | | | |
| e) 🔲 | e) 🔲 entered in part. See explanation below. | | | | | | |
| The amendment is disproved because of the various non-complient and 101 issues. | | | | | | | |
| The status identifiers for claims 51 - 56 list them as previously presented, but they have been newly added so they are labelled incorrectly. | | | | | | | |
| Claims 57 - 58 are listed as newly added, but no mention of them in the remarks to the amendment, so the remarks are not fully responsive to the amendment. | | | | | | | |
| Claim 51 has possible 101 issues because it is claiming just the program, and not the tangible result or operation of the program. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| SALEH NAJJAR SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |